

## BTPA Initial Equality Impact Assessment Template

<b>Name of function to be assessed</b>	ICV Scheme	<b>Date of assessment</b>	21/07/08
<b>Names of assessment team members</b>	Sam Elvy (Research & Policy Manager) Lucy Barrick (Business Support Manager)	<b>Is this a new or existing function?</b>	New
<b>1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Provides a framework for delivering BTPA's function for custody facility</li> <li>- Sets out arrangements for inspection of BTP custody facilities by ICVs from other police authority panels</li> <li>- Provides a sample template for entering into an agreement into with other police authorities to provide a custody visiting service</li> <li>-</li> </ul>		
<b>2. Are there any associated objectives of the function? Please explain.</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Provides clarity around how BTPA will mirror the duty placed on other police authorities to ensure independent inspection of their force's custody facilities</li> </ul>		
<b>3. Who is intended to benefit from this function and in what way?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- British Transport Police Authority</li> <li>- British Transport Police Authority</li> <li>- Force detainees in BTP facilities</li> <li>- Police authorities carrying out ICV visits on behalf of BTPA</li> <li>- BTPA SR&amp;CS Committee who has oversight of issues relating to custody facilities</li> </ul>		
<b>4. What outcomes are wanted from this function?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A clear summary of the purpose of and approach to inspection of BTP custody facilities by ICVs from other police authority panels – includes arrangements for visiting and reporting back from visits to BTP and BTPA</li> </ul>		

<b>5. What factors/forces could contribute/detract from the outcomes?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Policy not clear to end users</li> <li>- Policy not communicated and understood</li> <li>- Policy not followed</li> </ul>		
<b>6. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- BTPA</li> <li>- ICV panel members</li> <li>- Detainees in BTP facilities</li> <li>- Members of the SR&amp;CS Committee</li> </ul>	<b>7. Who implements the function and who is responsible for the function?</b>	- Business Support Manager
<b>8. Are there concerns that the function <u>could</u> have differential impact on racial groups?</b>	Yes (?)	<b>Please explain</b>	Inspection process would need to cover issues such as provision of information in alternative languages or access to an interpreter where appropriate.
<b>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</b>	No evidence but presumed that this is a potential issue.		
<b>9. Are there concerns that the function <u>could</u> have differential impact due to gender?</b>	Yes (?)	<b>Please explain</b>	Need to ensure that ICVs inspect to ensure adequate facilities for men and women – e.g. lavatory and hygiene provisions are adequate. May also need to consider the appropriateness of male/female visitors for particularly detainees.
<b>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</b>	Anecdotally (via discussions at APA meetings) that in other forces this has been an issue.		

<b>10. Are there concerns that the function <u>could</u> have differential impact due to disability?</b>	Yes (?)	<b>Please explain</b>	Need to ensure that scope of the visits considers the accessibility of custody facilities for both detainees and ICVs. Are the facilities provided appropriate for those detainees in custody?
<b>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</b>	No direct evidence, presumed this may be an issue.		
<b>11. Are there concerns that the function <u>could</u> have differential impact due to sexual orientation?</b>	No.	<b>Please explain</b>	
<b>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</b>	No evidence.		
<b>12. Are there concerns that the function <u>could</u> have differential impact due to age?</b>	Yes (?)	<b>Please explain</b>	Need to ensure that scope of the visits considers the appropriateness of custody facilities (and arrangements for them to have access to an appropriate adult) for detainees under the age of 18. Are the facilities provided appropriate for those detainees in custody?
<b>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</b>	Evidence from feedback of previous ICV visits to BTP facilities that appropriate adults may not be suitable. (Was there also an issue that relatives were not informed that a minor was in custody?)		

13. Are there concerns that the function <u>could</u> have differential impact due to religious belief?	Yes	<b>Please explain</b>	Need to ensure that ICVs inspect to ensure adequate facilities for people of faiths where there is a particular need for prayer facilities or where detainees may have special dietary requirements. May also need to consider the appropriateness of male/female visitors for particularly detainees.
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?	Presumed that this may be an issue.		
14. Are there concerns that the function <u>could</u> have differential impact due to people having dependents/caring responsibilities?	Yes	<b>Please explain</b>	Need to ensure that ICVs inspect whether appropriate arrangements are made for detainees who have dependents or other caring responsibilities .
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?	Presumed that this may be an issue.		
15. Are there concerns that the function <u>could</u> have differential impact due to people having an offending past?	No	<b>Please explain</b>	

What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?	No evidence.		
16. Are there concerns that the function <u>could</u> have differential impact due to people being transgendered or transexual?	Yes	Please explain	Need to ensure that ICVs inspect to ensure that detainees have access to adequate facilities e.g. lavatory and hygiene provisions are available which are appropriate for both male and female detainees.
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?	Presumed that this may be an issue.		
17. Could the differential impact identified in 8-16 above amount to there being the potential for adverse impact for this function?	Yes	Please explain	There is a risk that unless the policy is clear about its purpose and expectations the visits carried out by ICVs on behalf of BTPA may not assess and report back on all of the issues identified.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified on the grounds of equality of opportunity for one group? Or any other reason?	No.	<p><b>Please explain for each equality heading separately</b></p> <p>No all potentially negative impacts can be <u>addressed</u> by rewording the agreement template to set out more explicitly the issues to be addressed/considered by ICVs at each visit.</p>	

**Comment [SJ1]:** Lucy – are these issues specifically covered by the IVC code/guidance? There might be value in making it explicit in our scheme anyway.

<b>19. Should the function proceed to a full impact assessment</b>	No.	<b>20. If yes, is there enough evidence to proceed to a full EIA?</b> N/A
		<b>21. If no, are there any changes required to the function to improve it around the equality agenda?</b>  Reworking the agreement template to set out more explicitly the issues to be addressed/considered by ICVs at each visit.